

Message

---

**From:** Strynar, Mark [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5A9910D5B38E471497BD875FD329A20A-STRYNAR, MARK]  
**Sent:** 2/24/2016 7:20:18 PM  
**To:** Hillary Stoll [hjstoll@ncsu.edu]; Detlef Knappe [knappe@ncsu.edu]  
**CC:** Lindstrom, Andrew [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=04bf7cf26aa44ce29763fbc1c1b2338e-Lindstrom, Andrew]  
**Subject:** WAX versus HLB

FYI,

I looked at the work we did yesterday. The WAX worked very well for all, and the HLB did poorly for m/z 229 and 279 which are PFECA F and A respectively. HLB worked similarly for all others compared to the WAX. As expected the HLB does poorly for the low molecular weight PFCAs and the PFECA. The A and F PFECA are the two smallest. I propose using WAX capture of the compounds in 500 mL of water and a UPLC MS/MS analysis on the Acquity system.

There was some contamination of the PFECA G compound in the MB but not other compounds. I think we can work with this small amount as it was lower than the lowest curve point (10 ng/L).

We will now need to do more like 6-7 point cal curves and try to add some ISs we have (PFBA, PFHxA and PFOA) to serve as IS in the absence of matched IS compounds.

Mark